

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 238 365

HE 016 904

TITLE                    Self-Study Criteria for Governing Boards of Public Multicampus Higher Education Systems.

INSTITUTION            Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, Washington, D.C.; Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo.; State Higher Education Executive Officers Association.

SPONS AGENCY          Lilly Endowment, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind.

PUB DATE              83

NOTE                   20p.; For related documents, see HE 016 900-903.

AVAILABLE FROM        Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, One Dupont Circle, Suite 400, N.W., Washington, DC 20036 (\$15.00, nonmembers; \$4.50, members).

PUB TYPE              Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE            MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS           Accountability; Campus Planning; \*Check Lists; College Planning; College Role; Conflict Resolution; Educational Policy; \*Evaluation Criteria; Governance; \*Governing Boards; Government School Relationship; Higher Education; Institutional Autonomy; Interprofessional Relationship; Money Management; \*Multicampus Colleges; Questionnaires; \*Self Evaluation (Groups); State Boards of Education; \*State Colleges; State Officials; Trustees

ABSTRACT

Criteria for self-study for governing boards of public multicampus higher education systems are presented. For each criterion, questions are presented along with three response options: "yes," "no," and "do not know or can not judge." A response option for judging the board's overall performance on each criterion is also included. The criteria are as follows: system and institutional missions, board membership, board organization, basic educational policy, selection and assessment of executive officers, board relations with executive officers, board/faculty relations, board/student relations, financial resources and management, physical plant, court of final appeal, and accountability/autonomy. A checklist designed to help board members assess the extent to which they have absorbed their roles and institutions is also presented, which covers the trustee's background and traits, knowledge of the institution, board and committee meetings, and fund-raising and public relations. Finally, the following considerations are addressed by open-ended questions: issues that have most occupied the board's time and attention during the past year; one or two successes of the board; and shortcomings of the board's organization or performance. (SW)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
\* from the original document. \*



# self-study criteria

for governing boards  
of public multicampus  
higher education systems

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as  
received from the person or organization  
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve  
reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-  
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE  
position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS  
MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY  
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Association of  
Governing Boards of  
Univ & Colleges  
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

© 1983, Association of Governing Boards  
of Universities and Colleges  
One Dupont Circle  
Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
202/296-8400

Printed in the United States of America

This document may be reproduced only  
for the purpose of self-study by post-  
secondary education boards. Reproduc-  
tion, in whole or in part, for any other  
purpose shall require written permission  
of the Association of Governing Boards of  
Universities and Colleges.

**Suggestion to Users:** If there are items which you cannot respond to for any reason, please  
leave them blank and elaborate any difficulty briefly in the "comment" section for each  
criterion.

*Self-Study Criteria for Governing Boards of Public Multicampus Higher Education Systems*  
was developed with the assistance of a grant from the Lilly Endowment, Inc., and with the co-  
sponsorship of the Education Commission of the States and the State Higher Education  
Executive Officers.

**Criterion 1****System and Institutional Missions**

No university or college can be all things to all people. Each should have a clearly defined mission—a statement of purpose—if it is to be given rational direction. The board that governs a system of institutions must be cognizant of the educational needs of the people of the state, and the special abilities of each institution within the system to fulfill its part of those needs. It must also be keenly aware of the resources available to adequately fund each perceived educational need.

The board should carefully plan educational programs on a systemwide basis to avoid unnecessary duplication of programs of high unit costs and programs of high necessity but low enrollment potential. The board should make certain that the specific and unique goals of each institution are clearly enunciated to each academic community so that these goals can serve as guides to the faculty, to prospective students, and to the general public.

Yes     No     Don't Know/  
Can't Judge

1. Is there a statement of mission and related goals which is applicable to the system as a whole?

- a. If not, do you feel that such a statement should be prepared at this time?
- b. If so, is that statement timely and adequate?

2. Does each institution within the system have a single statement of institutional mission?

- a. Are you personally familiar (in general terms) with each of them?
- b. Have these statements been developed in relation to each other and to the system statement of mission?
- c. Were these statements developed by, or in consultation with, the institutions?
- d. Are these statements sufficiently clear and specific so that they can serve as guides to academic planning, decision making, and budgeting?
- e. Are they used to help assess institutional performance?
- f. Are these statements of mission periodically reviewed and discussed with the system's executive officer and campus executives?

3. Were members of the board personally involved in the development of statements of mission for:

- a. The system as a whole?
- b. Each institution within the system?

4. Have the statements of mission been related to the statewide plans, and the plans of other sectors (such as private higher education)?

**Summary:** In relation to this criterion, I feel that the board's performance has been:

Very Good \_\_\_\_\_ Good \_\_\_\_\_ Adequate \_\_\_\_\_ Poor \_\_\_\_\_ Don't Know/Can't Judge \_\_\_\_\_

Further comments or suggestions related to this criterion:

## Criterion.2

### Board Membership

The concept of a "balanced board" with sufficiently diverse personal backgrounds, points of view, interests, and skills has been given increased attention; particularly as it applies to lay governing boards of public institutions. These boards need responsible and dedicated persons with an array of specialized knowledge and skills if they are to govern effectively. The opportunity for the governing board of a state system to select its own members may be limited, but a board should be aware of its membership needs and make these known through whatever means are appropriate.

Yes      No      Don't Know/  
Can't Judge

1. Do you feel that the board contains a sufficient range of personal attributes, expertise, and external relationships to make an effective board?

2. Is there an effective means of communicating membership needs to the governor's office, legislature, or other appointing or confirming authority?

3. Do you feel that the members of the board have sufficient knowledge of the system and its institutions—their history and their role in higher education in the state—to judge the value of new ideas and practices with reasonable confidence in their decisions?

4. Do you feel that the board members understand their responsibilities to the whole system—not just to certain parts of it, or to certain of its constituencies?

5. Does the board have an established procedure for orienting new members to their duties and responsibilities?

**Summary:** In relation to this criterion, I feel that the board's performance has been:

Very Good \_\_\_\_\_ Good \_\_\_\_\_ Adequate \_\_\_\_\_ Poor \_\_\_\_\_ Don't Know/Can't Judge \_\_\_\_\_

Further comments or suggestions related to this criterion:

**Criterion 3****Board Organization**

The effectiveness of a board depends greatly on the structure of its organization and the conduct of its meetings. The board's own rules, formulated over time and frequently out of habit or tradition, determine these matters. A productive board is usually one that has periodically taken the time to assign priorities to its duties, critically review its organizational structures and rules of procedure, and update as needed sections of its bylaws, policy manual or operations manual.

The board should also review the procedures for formulating agendas and conducting meetings to see that necessary business is dispatched promptly, that implications of key policy decisions are carefully considered, and that time is not wasted on trivia or administrative detail.

Yes      No      Don't Know/  
Can't Judge

1. Within the past three or four years, has the board empowered a committee or enlisted counsel to review its procedures, committee practices, policies and bylaws, and to recommend improvements? \_\_\_\_\_
2. Is the board's agenda and supporting information sent to you in the right amount and far enough in advance to allow proper preparation for meetings? \_\_\_\_\_
3. Do you feel that the board's present committee structure:
  - a. Makes for efficient handling of the board's work? \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Gives the whole board the opportunity to consider fully all matters of key importance to the institution? \_\_\_\_\_
4. Do you feel that the organization of the board and the conduct of its meetings are such that the interests of every campus are adequately considered?
  - a. Do the particular interests of the "flagship campus," or any other single campus or group of campuses, tend to dominate the whole system? \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Does the board routinely make itself available to institutional executives at its meetings? \_\_\_\_\_
5. Does the board ensure that it has access to reports or the viewpoints of:
  - a. Faculty leaders/union representatives? \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Student leaders? \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. "Classified" employees? \_\_\_\_\_
  - d. The general public? \_\_\_\_\_
6. Does the board provide for reasonable rotation of its leadership? \_\_\_\_\_

**Summary:** In relation to this criterion, I feel that the board's performance has been:

Very Good \_\_\_\_\_ Good \_\_\_\_\_ Adequate \_\_\_\_\_ Poor \_\_\_\_\_ Don't Know/Can't Judge \_\_\_\_\_

Further comments or suggestions related to this criterion:

## Criterion 4

### Basic Educational Policy

The board should assume responsibility for making certain that each institution's declared mission is being fulfilled. With the aid and professional expertise of the faculty and administration, the board should ensure that necessary educational policies are formulated to guide the institutions toward stated goals. In addition, it should assess periodically the manner in which these policies are being implemented.

Yes      No      Don't Know/  
Can't Judge

1. Does the board keep itself generally informed (through staff reports or other means) of the trends and changes in society's educational needs — and the needs of today's students? \_\_\_\_\_
2. Do you feel that all the institutions your board governs are living up to their stated missions through the education programs they are now offering? \_\_\_\_\_
3. Does the board regularly receive reports from the chief executive officer on the progress of educational policy implementation?
  - a. Are these reports useful in assessing the quality of educational programs and their appropriateness to the institutions? \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Are academic personnel policies reviewed adequately (tenure, promotion, sabbaticals, retirement, etc.)? \_\_\_\_\_
4. Does the board take an active role, in close collaboration with administration and faculty, in long-range academic program and personnel planning? \_\_\_\_\_
5. Does the board receive copies or summaries of the reports of reaccreditation visiting teams? \_\_\_\_\_

**Summary:** In relation to this criterion, I feel the board's performance has been:

Very Good \_\_\_\_\_    Good \_\_\_\_\_    Adequate \_\_\_\_\_    Poor \_\_\_\_\_    Don't Know/Can't Judge \_\_\_\_\_

Further comments or suggestions related to this criterion:

**Criterion 5****Selection and Assessment of Executive Officers**

The selection of a system executive officer and the campus executive officers are major responsibilities of the governing board. Each selection should be preceded with a clear definition of the qualifications sought and expected accomplishments. Selection committees should solicit the viewpoints of all segments of the academic community. Unless this is done, the welfare of the community and that of the new executive may suffer.

It is also important that the board and each executive officer formally agree upon performance goals that will provide guidelines for his/her conduct of the office. If termination becomes necessary, it should be done in a manner which will not harm the reputation of the individual or the institution.

Yes	No	Don't Know/ Can't Judge
-----	----	----------------------------

1. Has the board adopted written procedures or guidelines for the process of selecting its principal executive officers? \_\_\_\_\_

2. Does the search committee (or its mandated procedures) provide for meaningful participation by members or groups of constituents such as administration, faculty, students, or alumni? \_\_\_\_\_

3. When the present incumbents were selected, were there:

a. Statements of specific duties and responsibilities? \_\_\_\_\_

b. Written sets of performance expectations? \_\_\_\_\_

c. Specific lists of perquisites (home, car, retirement plan, etc.)? \_\_\_\_\_

4. Has a procedure and schedule been established for formal presidential assessment? \_\_\_\_\_

a. Is it known and understood by all concerned? \_\_\_\_\_

b. Have the executives had a voice in the formulation of this procedure? \_\_\_\_\_

**Summary:** In relation to this criterion, I feel that the board's performance has been:

Very Good \_\_\_\_\_ Good \_\_\_\_\_ Adequate \_\_\_\_\_ Poor \_\_\_\_\_ Don't Know/Can't Judge \_\_\_\_\_

Further comments or suggestions related to this criterion:

## Criterion 6

### Board Relations with Executive Officers

The quality of the "working relationship" between the board and its principal campus or institutional officers is of critical importance to the effectiveness of the entire system. While the board must take responsibility for basic policies and their consequences, it must also give the system and campus executives the authority they need to act decisively. This is particularly necessary in crisis situations and in extended negotiations, but it is also true of day-to-day decision making. The board must not hamper these executives by becoming excessively involved in operational matters.

Yes      No      Don't Know/  
Can't Judge

1. Do you feel that there is an overall climate of mutual trust and support in the board's relationships with its system executive?

- a. With the system office's key staff person?
- b. With its campus executive officers?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

2. Are the role and authority of each principal executive clearly set forth in written form (in bylaws, operating manual, or other documents)?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

3. Is the board satisfied that it has reasonable access to the advice and concerns of institutional executives and the system executive?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

4. Has the board clearly stipulated each executive officer's authority to act decisively and negotiate firm settlements in crisis situations?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

5. Do you feel that the board becomes excessively involved in operational matters?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

6. [If appropriate] During collective bargaining negotiations, has the board supported its administrators, offered advice when requested, and expressed confidence when deserved and needed?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**Summary:** In relation to this criterion, I feel that the board's performance has been:

Very Good \_\_\_\_\_ Good \_\_\_\_\_ Adequate \_\_\_\_\_ Poor \_\_\_\_\_ Don't Know/Can't Judge \_\_\_\_\_

Further comments or suggestions related to this criterion:

**Criterion 7****Board Relations with Faculty**

In the area of academic affairs a very important part of a board's success in governing wisely is the nature of its relationship with the faculty. Most lay board members lack the professional expertise to legislate in the area of academic affairs, yet they share the burden of responsibility for the quality of the institution and for the manner in which the institution fulfills its academic goals. The board should rely upon professionals for advice in formulating governing policy, and delegate to them authority to carry out operational policies and procedures.

The avenue for this relationship should be through the system and campus executives because these persons work with the faculty on a day-to-day basis. The line between governing policy and operating policy should be established with reasonable clarity. The institution needs to be given academic direction, yet the faculty should have necessary freedom in the performance of its professional work.

Yes	No	Don't Know/ Can't Judge
-----	----	----------------------------

1. Does the board have a satisfactory organizational channel for continuing two-way communication with the faculty for information, opinions or advice? \_\_\_\_\_
2. Have the respective roles of the board, the administration, and the faculty been effectively delineated in the formulation of academic policy? \_\_\_\_\_
3. Do you feel that the board exercises authority over:
  - a. \_\_\_\_\_ More aspects of educational affairs than it needs to?
  - b. \_\_\_\_\_ Fewer aspects of educational affairs than it needs to?
  - c. \_\_\_\_\_ Neither; its participation in educational affairs is appropriate.
4. Has the faculty and/or administration formulated, and the board approved, up-to-date policies relating to:
  - a. Faculty promotion and tenure? \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Selection of new faculty? \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Faculty retrenchment whenever or wherever it may be necessary? \_\_\_\_\_
  - d. Standards of performance? \_\_\_\_\_
  - e. Acceptance of "outside" work or consultancies? \_\_\_\_\_
  - f. Faculty sabbaticals or professional leave? \_\_\_\_\_
  - g. Faculty grievance? \_\_\_\_\_
  - h. Information that should be part of a faculty member's permanent record and the conditions of its disclosure? \_\_\_\_\_
  - i. Conflict of interest? \_\_\_\_\_

**Summary:** In relation to this criterion, I feel that the board's performance has been:

Very Good \_\_\_\_\_ Good \_\_\_\_\_ Adequate \_\_\_\_\_ Poor \_\_\_\_\_ Don't Know/Can't Judge \_\_\_\_\_

Further comments or suggestions related to this criterion:

## Criterion 8

### Board Relations With Students

The board has a clear obligation to protect the welfare of students and their right to a campus environment that is conducive to scholarship, intellectual development and personal development. The students' health and comfort are essential to learning. The students' freedom to learn independently is a basic tenet of academic freedom, and like other freedoms it must be exercised under the obligation to protect the welfare of the community as a whole. The board must be sure that it has clear lines of communication through appropriate channels to and from students.

Yes      No      Don't Know/  
Can't Judge

1. Do you feel that the board has a satisfactory organizational channel for continuing two-way communication with students?

2. Is there an effective mechanism for reviewing periodically student satisfaction with the institution regarding:

- a. The academic program?
- b. Faculty performance?
- c. Student services?
- d. Extra-curricular programs?

3. Has the board approved policies that make adequate provision for the students' non-curricular (cultural, educational, recreational) activities?

4. Do the institutions and the system have governance policies for student appeal of perceived injustices (academic or other)?

5. Are there adequate policies and procedures for the smooth operation of the student financial assistance programs?

**Summary:** In relation to this criterion, I feel that the board's performance has been:

Very Good \_\_\_\_\_ Good \_\_\_\_\_ Adequate \_\_\_\_\_ Poor \_\_\_\_\_ Don't Know/Can't Judge \_\_\_\_\_

Further comments or suggestions related to this criterion:

**Criterion 9****Financial Resources and Management**

Requesting public funds from state financial departments, the governor and the legislature, is a most important function and, perhaps, the most difficult for the governing board. Louis H. Heilbron, veteran trustee in public higher education, has said: "The condition of success is credibility. The trustees must have a record of fiscal responsibility in operations. They also should have a reputation for making supportable budgetary requests, for asking for what is needed, taking into consideration a realistic approach to the state finances.... This posture — affirmative to obtain appropriations to meet demonstrated needs, yet restrained to show credibility — is difficult to establish and maintain." (Louis H. Heilbron. *The College and University Trustee*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1973)

Yes	No	Don't Know/ Can't Judge
-----	----	----------------------------

1. Do you feel that the board's review of budget requests is carried out with sufficient care, so that the resulting submission to the state is truly the board's own considered decision?

- a. Is the board then willing and able to defend it before appropriate state officials or agencies?
- b. Has the board demonstrated its ability to be effective with state agencies in this regard?

2. Do you feel that the board has established credibility in its funding requests by reasonably equating the necessity for programs with the availability of funds to support them?

3. Are the fiscal plans and budgets related to institutional and system master plan goals?

4. Is the board provided with meaningful and useful "yardstick information" to judge expenditures, such as trend comparisons, data on economic inflation factors, and comparisons with institutional costs in other states?

5. Has the board adopted guidelines that will regularly assure all concerned that the funds made available are managed wisely and spent prudently?

6. Does the board have an objective and clearly understood method to guide allocation of funds fairly and equitably among the institutions?

7. Are the campuses or institutions in your system encouraged to raise monies from private sources for specified purposes?

8. Are guidelines or policies for such fund raising adequate, particularly with regard to the role of the institutional foundation (if any)?

**Summary:** In relation to this criterion, I feel that the board's performance has been:

Very Good \_\_\_\_\_ Good \_\_\_\_\_ Adequate \_\_\_\_\_ Poor \_\_\_\_\_ Don't Know/Can't Judge \_\_\_\_\_

Further comments or suggestions related to this criterion:

## Criterion 10.

### Physical Plant

It is the board's responsibility to create and maintain a physical environment that is conducive to scholarship and learning and consistent with reasonable expectations of future funds. Decisions that involve campus master plans and the capital outlay budget requests are the major concerns. Prudence demands that maximum use be made of existing physical plants before construction or remodeling is considered. Efficiency of the board's time and effort require that it be concerned only with those matters that cannot be properly delegated to the administrative staff.

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Don't Know/  
Can't Judge \_\_\_\_\_

1. Has the board approved master plans for the campuses that reflect both present and anticipated needs?

2. Are the physical plans related to educational master plan goals?

3. Prior to its consideration of requests for remodeling or new construction, is the board satisfied that present space is being used effectively and instructional areas are scheduled for maximum use?

4. Do you feel that the board has established credibility in its capital funding requests by equating the necessity of proposed projects with the ability of the state to support them?

5. Do you feel that the board makes decisions on details related to buildings and grounds that should have been delegated to the administrative staff?

6. Is the board informed about and does it review periodically its position concerning:

a. Deferred maintenance?

b. Energy conservation methods?

c. Renovation versus new construction?

**Summary:** In relation to this criterion, I feel that the board's performance has been:

Very Good \_\_\_\_\_ Good \_\_\_\_\_ Adequate \_\_\_\_\_ Poor \_\_\_\_\_ Don't Know/Can't Judge \_\_\_\_\_

Further comments or suggestions related to this criterion:

## Criterion 11

### Court of Final Appeal

Governing boards may be called upon to fulfill a quasi-judicial function in the settlement of disputes arising within institutional communities. If possible, disputes should be settled at the administrative level where they originate. If this is not possible, the governing board may be asked to intervene. The board can control abuse of this privilege by carefully delegating authority for settlement of disputes at the administrative level, supporting these administrative decisions, and selectively refusing further involvement.

Yes  No  Don't Know/  
Can't Judge

1. Do you feel that the board has been called upon to adjudicate cases of conflict that should have been settled before they came to the board? \_\_\_\_\_
2. Has the board developed procedures for delegating the management of conflict situations to its executive officers, academic administrators, appropriate committees, or appropriate faculty or student organizations? \_\_\_\_\_
3. Are the disputes that have been brought to the board:
  - a. Accurately and concisely briefed for your study? \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Done so before they have escalated to crisis proportion? \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Settled without unduly prolonged debate? \_\_\_\_\_
4. Do you feel that the board has sought to settle disputes with sympathetic understanding of the human and institutional issues involved? \_\_\_\_\_
5. Does the board have a history of consistently supporting those decisions made by its executive and administrative officers that have been in line with established policy and procedure? \_\_\_\_\_

**Summary:** In relation to this criterion, I feel that the board's performance has been:

Very Good \_\_\_\_\_ Good \_\_\_\_\_ Adequate \_\_\_\_\_ Poor \_\_\_\_\_ Don't Know/Can't Judge \_\_\_\_\_

Further comments or suggestions related to this Criterion:

**Criterion 12****Accountability/Autonomy**

Every university or college needs to reassure its constituencies that it is adhering to its stated mission. The system is accountable for the quality of its educational programs, for prudent use of public resources; and for performance standards stemming from direct or indirect acceptance of certain public funds. However, the call for accountability must not become a demand for added control or ill-advised intrusions on essential autonomy. The system and its institutions must not only serve the public interest, they must be perceived as doing so.

Yes      No      Don't Know/  
Can't Judge

1. Do you feel that the system and its institutions have the confidence of the general public?

- a. Of the legislature?
- b. Of the governor's office?
- c. Do you feel that the expectations of these groups have changed in recent years? (If so, please elaborate below)

2. Does the board ensure that the institutions take advantage of opportunities to inform the public and other interested parties about educational and scholarly attainments, administrative objectives and accomplishments, and evidence of how funds have been utilized?

3. Has the board or its representatives established good working relationships with state offices, the legislature, and state agencies dealing with postsecondary education, that include recognition of the system's legitimate goals and necessary programs?

4. Are the majority of board members effective spokespersons for the system and its institution?

5. Has the board been willing to take a stand against unwarranted controls or other intrusions on the autonomy of institutions within the system?

**Summary:** In relation to this criterion, I feel that the board's performance has been:

Very Good \_\_\_\_\_ Good \_\_\_\_\_ Adequate \_\_\_\_\_ Poor \_\_\_\_\_ Don't Know/Can't Judge \_\_\_\_\_

Further comments or suggestions related to this criterion:

## General Assessment

1. What issues have most occupied the board's time and attention during the past year?
2. What were the one or two successes during the past year for which the board feels some satisfaction?
3. What particular shortcomings do you see in the board's organization or performance that need attention?
4. Other comments or suggestions?

## Trustee Audit

The responsibilities of individual trustees are different from those of boards as corporate entities. The following checklist is designed to help board members assess the extent to which they have absorbed the breadth and depth of their roles and institutions. The questions seem somewhat imposing, but they are not intended to cause acute trustee or presidential anxiety. A "perfect score" is an unreasonable expectation.

Candid responses can be helpful to the design of orientation programs for new board members, or future workshops and retreats. The checklist can be adapted to the unique characteristics of your particular institution as a supplement to the preceding board self-study criteria. It was developed by Richard T. Ingram, executive vice-president of AGB, as part of a *Handbook of College and University Trusteeship* (Jossey-Bass, 1980). The questions are the result of the scrutiny of a number of chief executives and trustees.

Yes      No      Somewhat  
or  
Sometimes

### Background

1. Do you feel you have adequate opportunity to understand your obligations, responsibilities, and opportunities for growth as a trustee? \_\_\_\_\_

2. Have you a clear grasp of your board's responsibilities? \_\_\_\_\_

3. Are you familiar with the stated missions, plans, and current policies of the institutions within your system? \_\_\_\_\_

4. Do you stay abreast of higher education trends, legislation, and other public policy by reading AGB Notes, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, AGB Reports, or other material? \_\_\_\_\_

5. Have you taken an opportunity recently to meet with trustees and educators from other institutions? \_\_\_\_\_

6. Do you have adequate opportunities to know your fellow trustees? \_\_\_\_\_

7. Do you find any conflict between your responsibility for the welfare and advancement of the various institutions in your system, and your responsibility to the citizens of your region, state, or nation? \_\_\_\_\_

8. Please indicate with an "X" your strongest areas of expertise based on your background and experience. \_\_\_\_\_

budget/finance \_\_\_\_\_  
investments \_\_\_\_\_  
management \_\_\_\_\_  
planning \_\_\_\_\_  
legal affairs \_\_\_\_\_  
plant management \_\_\_\_\_  
real estate \_\_\_\_\_  
education \_\_\_\_\_

student affairs \_\_\_\_\_  
faculty affairs \_\_\_\_\_  
fund raising \_\_\_\_\_  
public relations \_\_\_\_\_  
marketing \_\_\_\_\_  
government relations \_\_\_\_\_  
other: \_\_\_\_\_

9. Now go back and check (✓) any primary areas of interest outside of your background and experience. \_\_\_\_\_

*Public Multicampus-Higher Education Systems*

**Knowledge of the System**

Yes      No      Somewhat  
              or  
              Sometimes

10. Do you feel well informed about the type and quality of your system's educational programs? \_\_\_\_\_

11. Have you visited one or more campus(es) within the past year? \_\_\_\_\_

12. Are you familiar with the leadership effectiveness of:

- a. The key administrators of your system office?
- b. The chief executives of your individual campuses?

13. Are you acquainted with the physical plant and maintenance needs of all your institutions? \_\_\_\_\_

**Board and Committee Meetings**

14. Are you satisfied with your attendance at board and committee meetings? \_\_\_\_\_

15. Do you read the minutes of meetings to determine whether they faithfully represent the proceeding and decisions as you recall them? \_\_\_\_\_

16. Do you prepare for board meetings by reading the agendas and supporting materials? \_\_\_\_\_

17. Do you suggest agenda items? \_\_\_\_\_

18. Do you help board and committee meetings to steer clear of non-policy matters better left to the administration? \_\_\_\_\_

**Fund Raising and Public Relations**

19. Have you recently taken advantage of an opportunity to say a good word about your system to a policymaker or organization at the state level? \_\_\_\_\_

20. Do you take advantage of opportunities to inform other groups or persons about your system or higher education generally? \_\_\_\_\_

**Trustee Concerns**

Yes	No	Somewhat On Sometimes
-----	----	-----------------------------

21. Do you understand the concept of "fund-accounting"? \_\_\_\_\_
22. Do you find your system's financial statements intelligible? \_\_\_\_\_
23. Are you mindful of your system's planning and goal statements, and current policies when voting on proposals presented to the board? \_\_\_\_\_
24. Do you feel you are sensitive to the concerns of students and faculty while maintaining impartiality and a total system perspective? \_\_\_\_\_
25. Do you help meet the needs of your chief executive for occasional counsel and support in his or her often difficult relationships with the individual campuses or institutions as well as state policy leaders? \_\_\_\_\_
26. Do you appreciate the importance of keeping your chief executive informed in the event you establish personal communication lines with campus leaders, and of the need to avoid prejudiced judgments on the basis of such relationships? \_\_\_\_\_
27. Have you ever suggested to the governor or other appointing authority someone who would make an outstanding new board member? \_\_\_\_\_
28. Are you satisfied that there are no real or apparent conflicts of interest in your service as a trustee? \_\_\_\_\_
29. Do you avoid asking special favors of the administration, including requests for information, without the knowledge of the chief executive and the board chairperson? \_\_\_\_\_
30. If you have not already done so, would you be willing to serve as a committee chairperson or board officer? \_\_\_\_\_

Why (or why not)? \_\_\_\_\_

31. Have you found your trusteeship to be stimulating and rewarding thus far? \_\_\_\_\_

Why (or why not)? \_\_\_\_\_

32. How would you rate yourself as a board member at this time?

Above Average \_\_\_\_\_ Average \_\_\_\_\_ Below Average \_\_\_\_\_

# NOTES